DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 587 CS 505 092

AUTHOR Sproule, J. Michael
TITLE Whose Ethics in the Classroom? On the Politics of Ethics.
SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 85
GRANT F-21734-82; FB-21790-83
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (71st, Denver, CO, November 7-10, 1985).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Censorship; Educational History; Educational Trends; *Ethics; Higher Education; *Intellectual Freedom; Learning Processes; Media Selection; *Politics of Education; Secondary Education; Social Change; Speech Communication; Speech Curriculum; *Textbook Selection

ABSTRACT

The issue of whose "facts" and whose perspective will control classroom discussions of social questions tends to surface in one of two related ways: (1) in connection with efforts to mandate the content of the instructional matter, and (2) in connection with attacks on teachers whose instructional material contains facts or evaluations offensive to a powerful social group or interest. A historical survey of the political monitoring of those who would give instruction concerning the ethics of social action, with focus on the ethics of communication, indicates a rediscovery after World War I of the importance of the ethical communication practices in democratic politics. The popularity of critical propaganda studies in colleges and universities during the mid-1930s was a short-lived phenomenon, however, and in the increasingly tense political atmosphere of 1939 to 1941, opponents of education who probed social ethics often branded ethical analysis as part of a conspiracy to undermine dominant American institutions. In the 1940s and 1950s, forces opposed to critical social analysis levied charges against educators and textbooks. The place of ethics in present day classrooms is, at best, ambiguous. While the upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s created a renewed acceptance of inquiries into the nature of modern society, the politics of recent years has seen the anti-critical trends continue, although now in the form of pressure from a variety of social groups harboring strong political opinions about what should and should not be taught. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED268587

Whose Ethics in the Classroom?

On the Politics of Ethics

by

J. Michael Sproule
Associate Professor of Speech
Indiana University Southeast
New Albany, Indiana 47150

Presented at the convention of the
Speech Communication Association
Denver, November 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Michael Sproule
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Grateful acknowledgment for support of this research is due the National Endowment for the Humanities for the grant to this author of a Fellowship (FB-21790-83) and a Summer Stipend (F-21734-82). The author also extends thanks to Indiana University Southeast for travel support, to the IUS Library for assistance with hard-to-find items, and to the Ekstrom Library of the University of Louisville for a study carrel.

CS 505092

Whose Ethics in the Classroom? On the Politics of Ethics

We in the field of speech communication are familiar with the notion that politics poses ethical problems. The corresponding political aspects of ethics are less often considered, but are equally deserving of attention. To state the question, "whose ethics in the classroom?" is to raise the issue of whose "facts" and whose perspective will control classroom discussions of social questions. This issue tends to surface in one of two related ways: (1) in connection with efforts to mandate the content of instructional matter, and (2) in connection with attacks on teachers whose instructional material contains facts or evaluations offensive to a powerful social group or interest. This paper presents an historical survey of the political monitoring of those who would give instruction concerning the ethics of social action, with focus on the ethics of communication. This paper begins by noting the rediscovery, after World War I, of the importance of ethical communication practices in democratic politics. The remainder of the paper surveys the continuing tendency for powerful forces to keep watch on the efforts of educators to offer instruction that evaluates the ethics of political and social practices.

The Discovery of Communication Ethics

Ethical practices of communication were not an important aspect of the rationalist political theories that dominated late nineteenth century American political science. The premier textbook in government, Lord Bryce's The American Commonwealth, presented politics as a process by which the electorate rationally identified and communicated wishes to elected officials. Bryce's theory that public opinion was autonomous and supreme left no room for the idea that the public might itself be controlled through propaganda campaigns or through adulteration of news.1 Presented in this form, the ethics of politics and society was a self-regulating mechanism in which the public spontaneously corrected abuses.

By the time of American entry into World War I, the orthodox view of politics as the rational formation, expression, and execution of public opinion was on the decline. Realist writers, known collectively as the muckrakers, had done much to dispel the notion that society and politics simply reflected the wishes of democratic majorities. In particular, Will Irwin's series of fifteen articles for Collier's magazine in 1911 brought attention to the actual process by which the events became printed news. Irwin, who drew from his own experiences as a

reporter, and who interviewed prominent reporters and editors, cited various influences that colored journalistic copy. These included (1) the influence of advertisers, who often were given special favors by publishers, (2) the tendency for editors to associate with and take on the social attitudes of the wealthy, and (3) the occasional instances of business obtaining favorable coverage through outright bribery.2 At about the same time as Irwin was describing the realities of political communication, Graham Wallas' book, Human Nature in Politics, was calling attention to other weaknesses in rationalist views of political decision making. Specifically, Wallas contended that "the empirical art of politics consists largely in the creation of opinion by the deliberate exploitation of subconscious non-rational inference."3 In the decade before the Great War, as crowd psychology and Freudian psychoanalysis gave new credence to Wallas' views, the significance of ethical questions in politics increased. If politics was not simply the rational art of applying fact to judgment, if the choices by reporters, editors, and voters were subject to nonrational influence, then the ethics of political communication and choice was of considerable moment.

The Great War of 1914-1917 supplied the conclusive evidence that both broke the dominance of rationalism in political theory, and also created a conscious interest in how matters of socio-political ethics were treated in the curriculum. During the war, all belligerents established departments to persuade domestic and foreign audiences of the rightness of the nations' war policies. Pursued on a scale never before witnessed, these propaganda efforts eventually brought into view the ethical problems for democratic government that were posed by techniques and technologies of mass persuasion. In the United States, awareness of the social problem of propaganda grew slowly between 1914 and 1917. American opinion leaders were aware of the contest of pamphleteering waged between supporters of Germany and Britain during 1914 and 1915, a campaign that shifted conclusively against Germany after the sinking of the passenger liner, Lusitania, by a German submarine.4 By 1916, various sinister activities of pro-German agents and propagandists in the United States were becoming matters of public knowledge, including efforts to foment strikes in American plants producing war materiel for the Allies, and efforts to purchase newspapers. When the United States entered the war, these activities were widely publicized in government pamphlets and, later, in Congressional hearings.5 While the extensive British propaganda campaign was not yet seen in sinister terms by Americans, the German program, which mixed publicity and sabotage, had brought the term propaganda, previously a relatively neutral expression, into disrepute.

While the competing propaganda campaigns of the Allies

and the Central Powers had entered the public's consciousness in various ways, it was America's own U.S. Committee on Public Information that created the immediate context for postwar unease about mass persuasion. Created by Woodrow Wilson to rally the nation behind the war effort, the CPI reached out to Americans in every way permitted by the technology of the times. The CPI produced tens of millions of pamphlets, established a vast war news service, sent out 75,000 Four Minute Men speakers to address audiences between movie features and on other occasions, distributed posters to every corner of the nation, prepared films, and placed millions of donated advertising messages in various periodicals.

The CPI spread both Woodrow Wilson's progressive vision of a war to spread democracy, but also propagated themes of fear and hate. The Committee's pamphlets helped spread wartime spy manias by suggesting that rumors were the work of German agents, and those who mentioned them probably were in league with Germany. Many of the Committee's posters painted vivid picture of German soldiers working atrocities on innocent women and children.6 Thus, the committee contributed to the very atmosphere that tolerated and often encouraged attacks on anyone thought to be lukewarm in support of the war. Many attacks were retroactive complaints against pre-1917 writings that did not now conform to new dogmas about a world divided into absolutely good and absolutely evil nations. The war saw the inauguration of the now familiar practice of scrutinizing textbooks for their adherence to currently favored socio-political thought. For instance, a number of high schools banned books by historian James Harvey Robinson on such grounds as his having credited Germany with a tradition of good municiple government. Charges of this type became prevalent enough that the CPI considered establishing a division to handle inquiries about the loyalty of textbook authors.7

At the same time as the CPI's leaders shook their heads at absurd loyalty charges leveled against textbook authors, the organization was itself endeavoring to recruit teachers as propagandists to help build a uniform national opinion on the war. This action set the stage for postwar worries about the role of the government and special interests in prescribing the political content of instruction. The CPI's most direct overture to teachers was through its National School Service bulletin, a publication designed to "promote national unity by emphasizing the obligations of citizenship." The importance attached to the CPI's message to the schools is evident from the comment of CPI chairman, George Creel, that "if the war with its burdens and losses continued, the national morale would need the support of a message that went without fail into every home."8

In discussing the role of educators as proponents of the official wartime dogmas, it is important to note that

educators were, as a whole, eager to get in step with the CPI's view of the Great War as a contest between absolute good and absolute evil. Many prominent historians participated in the The National Board for Historical Service, an organization that collected data about enemy publications, and also helped prepare the CPI's pamphlets. For the duration of the war, this group took over History Teachers Magazine, published by the American Historial Association for high school teachers, and offered articles that parroted popular wartime simplifications about European history.9 The NBHS was prominent in promoting the War Issues Courses offered at many American colleges by the War Department. A syllabus of the War Issues course at Stanford University shows that the curriculum contained a liberal measure of wartime fable—e.g., that World War I began as part of a German-Austrian plot—mixed with accurate historical information.10

In the months after the Armistice that ended the Great War, both educators and the general public soon came to regret many aspects of their wartime enthusiasms. Public disillusionment with the war spread as reports of German atrocities gradually became discredited, as many war supporters compared the idealism of Wilson's 14 Points to the self-defeating harshness of the Versailles treaty, as many Americans felt guilt for their wartime intolerance, and as American historians helped dispel wartime myths of the Great War's origins by reporting findings from the war archives of the fallen Russian, German, and Austrian regimes. Sharing the growing postwar mood of disillusionment, American educators saw propaganda as the explanation for the nation's conversion and adherence to wartime attitudes that, in retrospect, seemed inaccurate. The new tendency to view publications of the Allies and of the CPI as propaganda led intellectuals, such as Walter Lippmann, to discuss ethical communication as a prerequisite for democratic government in the modern industrial world. Reflecting on wartime distortions, Lippmann wrote that protecting the integrity of the news was indespensible if the public was to have the means to intelligently exercise political rights.11

Major academicians quickly picked up the theme of propaganda as a modern social problem. Pointing out historical distortions in the treatment of recent political history in a Syllabus of the World War issued to principals in New York City, Charles Beard wrote of the dangers posed by propaganda disguised as education.12 F.H. Hodder, in an address the joint convention of the American and Mississippi Valley Historical Societies, enjoined historians to examine whether their own field's writings presented as fact the propagandas issued by partisans during various historical disputes.13 Soon educators were recommending that students and the general public be taught to critically examine various propagandas competing for their attention.14 The

dramatic rise of the communication industry during the 1920s leant a sense of urgency to those concerned about the ethics of mass persuasion. The wartime work of the CPI's advertising specialists had increased the visiblity and prestige of advertising, and expenditures by advertisers soared. The field of public relations received a similar boost, as thousands of former CPI workers entered the realm of private business. Academicians, too, began to find opportunities for consulting, and a group of psychologists founded a firm for this express purpose.15 Many educators worried over the effects on the public of the new floods of publicity. Concern about the ethics of modern mass persuasion were furthered by the occasional exposure of outright dishonesty, such as the campaign by the National Electric Light Association to subsidize textbook writers and newspaper editors in return for texts and articles that favored private ownership of electric power plants.16

The 1920s and 1930s saw the emergence of a considerable body of educational literature dealing with propaganda as a social problem. The subject was treated in major academic journals, and entries in Psychological Abstracts indicate the increasing attention paid to propaganda by social scientists. Concern about dishonest communication reached a highpoint during the mid-1930s. The publication in 1935 of the Social Science Research Council's comprehensive bibliography on propaganda shows that the subject was central to academic thought.17 By the mid-30s, major textbooks on propaganda were widely used in universities, and articles on propaganda analysis were frequently found in literature aimed at secondary school teachers.18

The culmination of the propaganda analysis movement among educators was the founding in 1937 of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis. Organized by Columbia University's Clyde R. Miller, the Institute was a private venture funded chiefly through the Edward A. Filene Goodwill Fund. Miller recruited an advisory board that included a number of established academic stars, such as Charles A. Beard, Robert S. Lynd, and James T. Shotwell, and also included such rising figures as Edgar Dale, Leonard Doob, and Alfred McClung Lee. The Institute published Propaganda Analysis, a monthly bulletin that contained both a feature article, giving either a method for analyzing propaganda or a case study of its operation, and an educational section stressing the application of propaganda analysis to current events. Propaganda Analysis was sent monthly to an eventual 10,000 subscribers, and an estimated one million children received instruction based on the Institute's materials.19 The Institute also published two book-length studies, one an analysis of Father Charles Coughlin's political sermons on radio, the other, a study of competiting war propagandas by Britain and Germany in 1940.20 As practiced by the Institute, propaganda analysis was a wide ranging investigation

that explicitly encouraged students to probe major social institutions of business and government, paying particular attention to how various points of view were presented through the media of radio, film, and newspaper.

The Declining Impulse of Ethics

The popularity of critical propaganda studies in colleges and universities during the mid-1930s was a short lived phenomenon. Critical analyses of the social structure were consistent with postwar disillusionment in the 1920s, and with Depression-era questioning of American society. However, in the late 1930s, as business fought to regain its preeminence against Depression-era attackers, and as the nation pulled together against perceived threats from abroad, critical probes into social ethics became less fashionable.

As the 1930s drew to a close, and the darkest days of the Depression passed, American business regained much of its former confidence, and a good measure of its past credibility. Business organizations were no longer willing to maintain silence in the face of social critics who offered challenges to beliefs, values, and practices cherished by economic and political elites. By 1939, the Advertising Federation of America was urging its affiliates to campaign against textbooks that contained critical analyses of advertising. The Federation was particularly displeased with the treatment of advertising given in Professor Harold Rugge's widely-used book, An Introduction to Problems of American Culture. Rugge's observations about the tendency of advertising to manipulate the consumer, and occasionally to misrepresent products, were false, the Federation contended, since advertising reduced prices by allowing mass production, and because advertising abuses were infrequent.21 In 1940, the National Association of Manufacturers commissioned Ralph W. Robey to survey major textbooks. Robey contended that many books were "un-American in tone and derogatory to the American form of government and the capitalist system." Robey's main objection to the textbooks was that the books encouraged students to adopt "a critical attitude" toward current affairs.22

The Institute for Propaganda Analysis became a prominent target for those opposed to critical analyses of the social structure. In early 1941 the chief investigator for the House Un-American Activities Committee, Dr. J.B. Matthews, announced that the Institute had been under investigation by HUAC in view of its alleged left-wing bias. Matthews specifically disapproved the Institute's earlier critical review of the methods of HUAC, and he mentioned instances where members of the Institute's board

had taken public positions on such issues as aid to anti-Franco refugees from Spain. After Matthews' brief announcement, the Institute heard nothing more from the House committee.23

In the increasingly tense political atmosphere of 1939-1941, opponents of education that probed social ethics often branded ethical analysis as part of a conspiracy to undermind dominant American institutions. The March 1, 1941 newsletter of the New York State Economic Council warned of a broadly-based "program of collectivizing the United States" by undermining private enterprise. The Institute for Propaganda Analysis, the Progressive Education Association, textbook writers in social science "who have caught the collectivist vision from Soviet Russia," such as Professor Rugg, and varous religious social action organizations, were identified as prominent co-conspirators.24 Others unsympathetic with encouraging students to think about social values could be even more inflamatory than the New York Economic Council. Clyde Miller, founder of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, was branded a communist "fellow traveler" for his work with the group. Martin Dies, chairman of HUAC, casually referred to the Institute's educational director, Violet Edwards, as a red, a charge that the president of Columbia University treated humorously when he subsequently met her in the hallway.25

Educators of the late 1930s and early 1940s did not welcome the political attacks on their efforts to include in the curriculum discussions of social and political ethics. Clyde Miller, for example, vigorously opposed the effort to link him to red totalitarianism by means of vague innuendo. Fortunately, the social atmosphere was not yet completely hostile for educators such as Miller. Harold Lavine, editorial director of the Institute, recalled that while individuals and groups did not welcome the Institute's critical reviews of their political efforts, their reactions were not particularly fearful given the lack of a Cold War atmosphere to justify such tactics as red-baiting.26 Educators vigorously resisted the critics of criticism. For instance, in response to the charges of "un-Americanism" in American textbooks, the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom created a committee of prominent social scientists to investigate the attack by the National Association of Manufacturers. The ACDIF thereupon campaigned against the textbook investigations of HUAC, arguing that educational standards, not political orthodoxy, should govern the writing and selection of school materials.27

At the same time that educators were overtly defending ethical scrutiny of contemporary society, a subtler force was at work within academe to discourage the formerly vigorous interest by academicians in the ethics of society's structures and communication practices. Since World War I,

the movement to make social science research appear more similar to work in the natural sciences had gained considerable ground. The prestige of the newer, more descriptive, and less explicitly evaluative social research was growing. Furthermore, the move to conduct social research according to experimental and statistical methods was supported by grants from government and private business.

The rise of statistical-experimentalism in social science acted to dampen interest by academicians in social ethics. This tendency is clear in communication research, as when Hadley Cantril, first president of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, worried about having his name connected to an article in Propaganda Analysis that compared the private ownership and control of American broadcasting to the systems of Britain and Germany. Cantril was concerned that his seeming to evaluate the structure of American broadcasting might jeopardize his winning renewal of a contract from the Rockefeller Foundation for survey research on the mass media.28

Positive institutional inducements for survey and experimental communication research accelerated during World War II, when the Rockefeller Foundation supported content analysis of enemy communications, and when the Army established a Research Branch that conducted surveys and experiments to help evaluate the effectiveness of the Army's training and morale programs. The proven usefulness to an institutional sponsor of the ostensibly value-free wartime statistical-empirical research made the newer research methods dominant in the postwar period.

The effects oriented research was organized so as to help the producer of communication, as opposed to the devotion of the 1930s propaganda studies to aiding consumers make sense of appeals directed to them. While the newer research methods were far from value free—because they tacitly accepted the validity of existing patterns of organization and control—the statistical-empirical research methods nevertheless subordinated ethical issues by giving them little, if any, explicit attention.

The new opportunities for postwar academic social scientists to conduct prestigeous research while, at the same time, avoiding asking troubling questions about the social structure, came at an fortuitous moment. For during the postwar years, the social atmosphere was not hospitable for searching inquiries into the desirability of America's social structures and social practices. While the effort to connect academic studies in social ethics to Russian bolshevism was by no means new, the mood of postwar America was more receptive to such appeals. Around the world, the advancing spectre of communism was made real by the fall of China to the red armies of Mao Tse-tung. Charges that the advance of communism abroad and at home was due to the work of domestic subversives were fueled by the conviction of

Alger Hiss on charges of perjury stemming from his having evidently passed State Department documents to a communist agent. Worries about the nation's external and internal security lent credibility to those who endeavored to rid education of critical, ethical analysis.

Prominent among the tactics used to discourage evaluation of contemporary society were personal attacks on the educators, and efforts to censor the educational material. Kirtley Mather, the Harvard geologist and former president of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, was one educator so slandered. Notwithstanding his life-long prominence as a Baptist lay leader, and his reputation as an academic scientist and educator, Mather suffered many anonymous and/or vague accusations as to his loyalty during the twenty years after World War II. The most widely-distributed attack on Mather came with his inclusion in a list of 50 so-called "dupes and fellow travelers" prepared by Life magazine, a roster that also named Albert Einstein and Leonard Bernstein. The Life and other charges were based on the tactics of innuendo and guilt by association, in which figures such as Mather were attacked for their stands on public issues, or for having connections to groups that were later shown to include communists as members.29 When Mather was elected president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Senator Joseph McCarthy, twisting Mather's record of active, open participation in politics, fashioned the charge that his election constituted evidence of "Communist infiltration into the ranks of science."30

In addition to attacking educators, forces opposed to critical social analysis levied charges against various textbooks. Textbook censorship campaigns, often based on improbable allegations, were rampant during the 1940s and 1950s. In the atmosphere of McCarthyism, it was possible to gain a hearing for virtually any charge that a book was part of the communist plot, as when one member of the Indiana Textbook Commission called for removal of Robin Hood in view of its alleged promotion of communist doctrines. In Texas, a 1953 law required that for a textbook to be adopted, its author had to swear an oath that he or she had never been a member of the Communist Party or other group listed as subversive by the U.S. Attorney General.31

Ethics in the Contemporary Curriculum

The place of ethics in today's classrooms can be only described as ambiguous. This ambivalent role of contemporary ethical analysis owes to the legacy of 1940s and 1950s anti-critical trends, on which has been superimposed 1960s and 1970s political activism. The existence of contradictory impulses regarding ethical education easily may be discerned. On the one hand, a number of trends encourage

educators to include ethical analysis in their instruction. One trend favoring an open-minded scrutiny of society is that vague McCarthyesque charges today are less effective as means to discredit advocates and arguments. McCarthy, himself, is almost universally discredited, and uses of his favorite tactics of innuendo and guilt by association invariably bring the odium of "McCarthyism" upon their users. The weakening of the smear tactic creates a climate in which one faces less risk in probing below the suface of contemporary issues and institutions. The acceptability of critical analysis today, in theory if not always in practice, is illustrated in President Ronald Reagan's advice to a group of college students that youth should not take statements, even from the president, at face value, but, rather, should check them out.32

Basic to the recent rehabilitation of ethical analysis was the rediscovery, during the Vietnam and Watergate episodes, of the social value of probing analysis of the ethics of advocates, institutions, and arguments. The reawakening of the public to the notion that leaders may be ignorant, may harbor base motives, and may lie, inspired educators increase their attention to social ethics. This tendency is well illustrated by Vietnam-era Teach-ins, and by an anecdote related by Howard Kahane in the preface to his 1971 text on Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric. Kahane described a class in which he was "going over the (to me) fascinating intricacies of the predicate logic quantifier rules," when "a student asked in disgust how anything he'd learned all semester long had any bearing whatever on President Johnson's decision to escalate in Vietnam."33 In the speech communication field, the new market for ethical analysis was met by studies in contemporary rhetorical criticism.

While the upheavals of the '60s and '70s created a renewed acceptablity for searching inquiries into the nature of modern society, the politics of recent years has seen the anti-critical trends continue, though in altered form. In the field of communication, just as the move to "value free" studies in the 1940s dampened interest in probing the moral elements of the communication industry, today's effort to meet students' demands for relevant vocational experience during the college years, acts to divert attention from ethical issues. Review of today's communication textbooks shows that considerations of the ethical import of the communication industry--its structures, patterns of control, relation to political democracy, and impact on social welfare--are not treated as a crucial topics that deserve one or more chapter-length treatments. Ethical matters typically represent an occasional aside, or stage whisper, in our instructional literature. Ironically, the best known critique of educational vocationalism in our own field, Donald Ellis' essay on "The Shame of Speech

Communication," faults applied organizational communication more for its failure as pure research than its disinterest in the broad ethical questions raised by the communications of modern business and government.34

Moving beyond the communication curriculum, the chief disincentive to classroom treatments of social ethics stems from contemporary political machinations. Whereas educators in the 1940s and 1950s had mainly to contend with rightist charges of un-Americanism--and in the case of certain literature, the accusation of obscenity--the teacher of 1985 faces demands from a variety of social groups that harbor strong political interests about what should and should not be taught. No one who submitted manuscripts to academic journals or commercial text publishers in the last ten years is unaware of the charge that certain linguistic usages are "sexist." Neil Postman, editor of ETC., recently reprinted and discussed a number of letters he continues to receive from readers who demand that the journal adopt their views on the proper use of pronouns. The letter writers both tabulated the offensive forms and offered advice on style books that handled the matter correctly.35 From Longview, Texas, Mel and Norman Gabler's Educational Research Analysts organization today sends out reports on school books, warning state textbook committees about immoral literature, and historical narratives which deviate from "traditional American values." A typical objection was that a history text might "arouse racial tensions" by devoting too much space to the topic of slavery, an institution long ago eliminated.36 Nearly everyone is familiar with the 1981 court challenge to the Arkansas law that required "creation-science," (i.e., the theory of creation based on the account given in the book of Genesis) to be given "balanced treatment" (with respect to evolution) in science classes. The law was overturned by U.S. District Judge William R. Overton who found that creation-science was religious dogma thinly masked as science.37

In today's socio-political atmosphere, seemingly everyone has ideas on what consitutes an appropriately written textbook. As Harold Miller, C.E.O of Houghton Mifflin, points out, "nobody wins all the battles" in textbook adoption struggles that are waged in the pluralistic atmosphere of contemporary politics.38 One occasional result of diverse challenges to textbooks is the strategy of safety, that is, the effort to publish works that aim to offend as little as possible. When inoffensiveness is the intent, the outcome can be dull high school history texts, or biology books that use euphemisms for evolution.39

In September 1985, William J. Bennett, U.S. Secretary of Education, urged that American schools bridge the nation's diverse convictions and interests to instill a core of such common values as patriotism, self-discipline, thrift, honesty, and the conviction "that there is a

moral difference between the United States and the Soviet Union."40 That Bennett addressed his remarks to an organization which opposes sex education and "secular humanism," illustrates the problem of implementing his and anyone else's vision of ideal ethical education. Whose ethics in the classroom? In a diverse, pluralistic, constitutional republic, based on virtually universal suffrage, the question is political as well as educational. The politics of ethics inevitably surfaces every time a teacher enters a social studies classroom, or a text writer faces blank paper.

Endnotes

1. James Bryce, The American Commonwealth (2 vols.; 3rd ed.; N.Y.: Macmillan, 1899), II, 247-270, especially.

2. Irwin's series of articles is reprinted in Will Irwin, The American Newspaper (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1969).

3. Graham Wallas, Human Nature in Politics (London: Constable, 1948), p. 18. This is a reprint of the third edition of 1920. The book was originally published in 1908.

4. Large collections of the pro-British pamphlets, most prepared by Britain's Wellington House propaganda department or by affiliated groups, are to be found in the Widener Library, Harvard University, and in the Hoover Institution Archives. A useful secondary source on the British effort is James D. Squires, British Propaganda at Home and in the United States from 1914 to 1917 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935). The best account of pre-1917 pro-German propaganda in the United States is given by one of the propagandists, George S. Viereck, Spreading Germs of Hate (N.Y.: Liveright, 1930).

5. See, for instance, German Plots and Intrigues in the United States During the Period of Our Neutrality, by Earl E. Sperry and Willis West (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Committee on Public Information, July 1918). See U.S. Congress, Senate, Brewing and Liquor Interests and German and Bolshevik Propaganda, Hearings, Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, 66th Congress, 1st Session (3 vols.; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1919).

6. Two of the CPI's anti-rumor pamphlets, The German Whisper, and The Kaiserite in America, are characterized, respectively, in Stephen Vaughn, Holding Fast the Inner Lines (Chapel Hill: U. of North Carolina Press, 1980), pp. 78-79, and in James R. Mock and Cedric Larson, Words that Won the War (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939), pp. 175-177. Atrocity images in CPI posters are shown in Vaughn, pp. 162-167.

7. Guy Stanton Ford, head of the CPI's pamphlet program, recalled the attack on Robinson in Reminiscences of Guy Stanton Ford (1956), in the Oral History Collection of Columbia University, pp. 396-397. See memorandum to the attention of George Creel, Chairman of the CPI, August 24, 1918 (evidently by Guy Ford) suggesting a division to review textbook complaints, in Container CPI 3-A2: Ahern to Meek, Folder CPI 3-A2, Creel, George, Records of the Committee on Public Information, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

8. On the design of the National School Service bulletin, see Vaughn, p. 98. Creel's assessment of the importance of the publication is taken from How We Advertised America (N.Y.: Arno Press, 1972 [facsimilie printing of original 1920 edition]), p. 111.

9. The work of the NBHS is summarized in Carol Gruber, Mars and Minerva (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1975), pp. 120-137.

10. The Stanford War Issues Course syllabus is found in Box 2, Papers of the U.S. War Department, Committee on Education and Special Training, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford, California.

11. Lippmann's conclusions were presented first in two articles for the Atlantic Monthly (November and December 1919), and later in his Public Opinion (N.Y.: Macmillan, 1922).

12. Charles A. Beard, "Propaganda in the Schools," The Dial, 66 (June 14, 1919), 598-599.

13. F. H. Hodder, "Propaganda as a Source of American History," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 9 (June 1922), 1-18.

14. See, for instance, Edward K. Strong, "Control of Propaganda as a Psychological Problem," Scientific Monthly, 14 (March 1922), 234-252.

15. On the increase of advertising during the 1920s, see Otis Pease, The Responsibilities of American Advertising (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958), pp. 10-13. Edward L. Bernays, a wartime CPI official who founded a public relations firm, is representative of the postwar vigor of the growing field of public relations. On the birth of the Psychological Corporation, see J. McKeen Cattell, "The Psychological Corporation," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 110 (November 1923), 165-171.

16. The investigation by the AAUP of NELA subsidies to professors is given in Edwin R. A. Seligman, "Propaganda by Public Utility Corporations," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, 16 (1930), 349-368.

17. See Harold D. Lasswell, et al., Propaganda and Promotional Activities: An Annotated Bibliography (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1935).

18. Major propaganda textbooks, in the fields of political science, sociology, and psychology, respectively, are Peter Odegard, The American Public Mind (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1930), Frederick E. Lumley, The Propaganda Menace (N.Y.: Century, 1930), and Leonard W. Doob, Propaganda: Its Psychology and Technique (N.Y.: Holt, 1935). Typical of articles for secondary school teachers on the subject of propaganda is William H. Kilpatrick, "Propaganda, Democracy and Education," School and Society, 49 (1939), 405-409.

19. These estimates are contained in Propaganda Analysis, IV, No. 13 (February 1942), p. 2, and in the New York Times, February 21, 1941, p. 1.

20. See Alfred McClung Lee and Elizabeth B. Lee, The Fine Art of Propaganda (N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace, 1939), and Harold Lavine and James Wechsler, War Propaganda and the United States (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940).

21. See "Propaganda Purge," Time, July 10, 1939, p. 42.

22. See "NAM Textbook Survey Arouses Storm," Publishers' Weekly, 139, No. 9 (March 1, 1940), 1023-1024.

23. See letter of Kirtley F. Mather, Institute president, regarding Matthews' charges, in Propaganda Analysis, IV, No. 3 (March 27, 1941), 11. The Institute's critical review of HUAC was published in Propaganda Analysis, III, No. 4 (January 15, 1940), 1-12.

24. Economic Council Letter, New York State Economic Council, No. 91 (March 1, 1941), Papers of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, privately held by Alfred McClung Lee, Madison, New Jersey. Subsequent to my examination of the Institute papers, Dr. Lee arranged for their placement in the New York Public Library.

25. The charge against Miller was made by Charles Harrison in a letter to the New York World-Telegram, November 23, 1942, p. 22. This clipping and correspondence resulting from it are to be found in the Papers of Kirtley F. Mather, HUG 4559.500.5.2, Folder marked Institute of Propaganda Analysis (closing file). November 1941 [1], Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Violet Edwards mentions the charge by Martin Dies, in Interview with Violet Edwards Lavine, Phoenix, Arizona, December 11-12, 1982.

26. Interview with Harold Lavine, Phoenix, Arizona, December 11-12, 1982.

27. See letter of Frank Boas, chairman of the ACDIF, April 2, 1940, in Mather Papers, Folder labeled American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom to Jan. 1942.

28. Letter of Hadley Cantril to Clyde Miller, February 1, 1938, Papers of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis.

29. See Kennard B. Bork, "Kirtley Fletcher Mather's Life in Science and Society," Ohio Journal of Science, 82 (1982), 74-95.

30. The Harvard Crimson, October 24, 1950, pp. 1, 6, in Folder "'Guilt by Association,' material, mostly personal," Papers of Kirtley F. Mather, Denison University Archives, Granville, Ohio.

31. See Walter M. Daniels (ed.), The Censorship of Books (N.Y.: H.W. Wilson, 1954), pp. 127-128, 29, respectively.

32. Courier-Journal, September 11, 1985, p. A1.

33. Howard Kahane, Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric (Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth, 1971), p. vii.

34. Donald G. Ellis, "The Shame of Speech Communication," Spectra, March 1982, pp. 1-2.

35. "Foreword," ETC., 42 (1985), 3-6.

36. See Edward R. Jenkinson, Censors in the Classroom (N.Y.: Avon Books, 1979), pp. 108ff. Quotation is from p. 109.

37. Overton's opinion, and other essays dealing with the controversy, may be found in Academe, 68, No. 2 (March-April 1982).

38. Quoted in "Guild Symposium on Textbooks and Free Speech," Authors Guild Bulletin, Spring 1985, p. 27.

39. See, for instance, "Guild Symposium," p. 30, and "California's Bill Honig Moves Against the Censors of U.S. Textbooks," People, October 7, 1985, pp. 57-58, 63.

40. Courier-Journal, September 22, 1985, p. A9.